

1509/1159.

A
L E T T E R
TO
THEOBALD M'KENNA, ESQ.
THE
CATHOLIC ADVOCATE;
IN REPLY
TO THE
CALUMNIES
AGAINST THE
ORANGE INSTITUTION;
CONTAINED IN HIS PAMPHLET PURPORTING TO BE
A MEMOIRE ON SOME QUESTIONS RESPECTING
THE PROJECTED UNION, &c. &c. &c.
WITH
OBSERVATIONS
ON THE
NEW AND FURTHER CLAIMS
OF THE
CATHOLICS,
AS AFFECTING THE
CONSTITUTION AND PROTESTANT ESTABLISHMENT.

WITH AN APPENDIX,
CONTAINING SOME ANIMADVERSIONS ON THE POPULAR
PAMPHLET ENTITLED, "AN IMPARTIAL VIEW OF
THE CAUSES LEADING THIS COUNTRY TO THE
NECESSITY OF AN UNION," &c. &c. &c.

BY AN ORANGEMAN. K

*Paras Hominum vitis gaudet constanter, et urget
Propositum:*

D U B L I N:
PRINTED FOR J. MILLIKEN, NO. 32, GRAFTON-STREET.

1799.

REF. A. C. E.



P R E F A C E.

ITHINK it necessary to premise, that the following work does not contain any arguments for or against an Union; that subject has been already so copiously and prematurely discussed, as to become worn out and trite, even before the question is known, or has been propounded: So that we may find the common adage inverted, and see a *new* friend with an *old* face.

The Memoire of Mr. M'Kenna, under the pretext of treating of some questions, respecting the Union, is, in reality, a Catholic Manifesto, denouncing the Orangemen, as enemies to the Catholic cause, monopolists, and disturbers of the public peace. The gauntlet thrown down with such fierce defiance, I have taken up. The object of these sheets is, to refute these weighty charges, and rebut the
A 2 slander,

flander, by stating the principles, conduct, and relative situation, of the Protestants and Catholics in this kingdom; with some strictures on the new and unwarrantable pretensions of the latter. The reader need not search for any underplot or ambiguity—there is none such. I have endeavoured, without aiming at what is called composition, to express myself in the most plain and intelligible language, and that degree of seriousness, which subjects of great national concern demand, though it has lately been the fashion to treat them with farcical buffoonery, and grinning levity. How far I have succeeded, the public will judge.

A LETTER

LETTER

TO

THEOBALD M'KENNA, Esq. &c.

SIR,

TAKING up a pamphlet bearing your name on its title-page, and purporting to be, A Memoire on the Projected Union, I expected to find that subject generally discussed, and from former proofs of your ability as a writer, I deduced hopes of receiving some new lights, on that important question; under this impression, I travelled with you, to your 16th page, not without some approbation, and pleasure, when to my great surprise, and disappointment, your real plot opened, and I discovered, that the scope and tendency of your Memoire, however ushered in and masked, under the most plausible introductory pretensions, was neither more or less, than to make a most gross and audacious attack, on the principles, and conduct, of the loyal Protestants of Ireland,

land, and in this again, you display an address truly Jesuitical: You are an avowed Catholic advocate, and it might be expected, that you should rest their cause in some degree, on their merits as a body, or their obedience to the laws, their public virtue, their morality, or their loyalty; but no! you wisely desert those grounds, as not tenable, and instead of defending your own, you boldly attack, what you consider an enemy's position, vainly hoping, by calumniating the Protestants, to serve and forward the cause of the Catholics.

You at once roundly assert, that Ireland can never be settled by domestic means—and why? Because the loyal Protestants of Ireland have dared to form associations, for the defence and support of the constitution, and their religion, and because they have also dared, in defiance of rebellion, and Popery, to wear openly, an Orange ribband, as a badge, or symbol, of their association. Though not an old man, I recollect the time, when a publication such as yours, would have been considered a species of treason against the constitution, and would have subjected the writer, to exemplary punishment; but now thanks to the liberality, as it is termed, cut in reality to the profligate apathy of the present day, any public concern of morality, virtue, or religion, may be safely invaded, and men are only to be roused, by trenching on their private and paltry interests.

The best refutation I can offer, to your false and scandalous libel, is to tell you, who and what those Orangemen, whom you revile, are, which you may possibly not thoroughly know, though I suspect there is much of pretended ignorance, affected terror, and wilful perversion, among those of your sect, in regard to

to the Orange institution. The exposition of the origin and principles of the Orange association, will necessarily lead me to a discussion of the principles and views of the Catholics, their merits, and their claims, and the dreadful consequences, which must inevitably ensue, should fate, or our madness, ever grant to them full means of obtaining political power; I shall afterwards, Sir, advert to some of your assertions, and positions, in such order as they occur; and in so doing, I shall sedulously avoid any opinion, or discussion, on the question of the projected Union, and solely confine myself to remarks, on what you have advanced against the Orange societies, and in favour of the Catholics, and their claims.

The name of Orangemen was first adopted by some Protestants in the county of Armagh, at a time when the jealousies excited by the exercise of the portion of political power, newly granted to the Catholics, had unfortunately broke out, in open hostility, and mutual outrages, and after the violence of those feuds had ceased, Orange associations still continued, and spread over many parts of the province of Ulster. In the year 1797, when the system of the United Irishmen had attained a great degree of maturity, and was every day threatening open rebellion, and when the Catholics, little grateful for past favours, demanded new concessions, amounting to a surrender of the constitution, under the fantastical name of Catholic emancipation, which stood foremost among the postulata of the rebels, then I say, at that dangerous crisis, a plan was formed, and executed, of transplanting the Orange association from the North to the metropolis, and by regulating and improving the system, and placing at its head men of higher rank and talent, to convert to the support of the Throne
and

and the Constitution, an institution, which from the nature of its origin and formation, might have degenerated into a ferocious spirit of persecution, this plan was the more beneficial and laudable, as any attempt to crush the association, in the place of its origin, would have been highly dangerous and impolitic, and therefore it was wise and expedient to direct the motions and progress of a machine, which could not, with safety, be stopped. The detaching the Presbyterians from the Union, as it was then called, was also a strong motive. The publication of the principles of the institution, soon became necessary, to refute the various falsehoods and calumnies levelled with unceasing malice against the Orangemen.— Many enrolled themselves in the association, in consequence of the decided part the Catholics then began openly to take in the impending rebellion, and I am convinced that many persons were preserved firm in their allegiance, from the support and example of these societies, who, had they not found such a refuge, would have been betrayed by their fears into the society of the Union. I refer to the declaration of the Orange principles, and I do declare as an Orangemen, that in that declaration, the principles of the institution have been fully and wholly set forth, without equivocation or reservation. Now, I say, that the Orangemen of Ireland, as at present constituted, are merely loyal Protestants, associated and bound together, under no new or unknown principles, but solely for the purpose of keeping in memory, supporting, and defending the Laws, Constitution, and Religion, as established by the great King William, at the glorious Revolution, and reviving, by a fresh obligation, their sense of a solemn and sacred duty, and their determination, as far as in them lies, to perform that duty,

duty, namely, that of transmitting unimpaired to their children, that Constitution, in Church and State, which they received, as a most precious gift, and deposit, from the hands, and cemented with the blood, of their fathers. It hence follows, that every true and loyal Protestant, though he has not formally renewed such his duty, by any fresh obligation, is virtually and morally bound, by the same ties and principles, as a sworn Orangeman. I do assert, that the circumstances of the times called for some new spur, some further test, some fresh pledge, of mutual assistance, and of energy in the support, and defence of our laws, our religion, our persons, and our properties—for there is nothing more certain, than that they are bound in one sheaf, and should the band once be loosened, all will be scattered, trodden under foot, dissipated and lost. We were assailed at once by the whole host of French principles, their spurious liberty, and mock equality, the rights of man, republican fanaticism, the rage of political innovation, and the monstrous union of atheism and superstition, and all these had to work on a divided, and discontented nation, the majority of which considered the Constitution and Government as a foreign usurpation, and the established Religion an impious and damnable heresy; but more dangerous than all, many among ourselves began to be infected by a strange apathy, and luke-warmness, towards things formerly considered as claiming our warmest interest and attachment. I hope, and believe, that the Orange institution has given to us an animating and seasonable impulse, and has tended to rouse us to a sense of our danger, and our duties, and nothing leads me more strongly to this belief, than the hatred, abuse, and fear, manifested by the people of a cer-

tain description, against an association which they seem to consider as a bulwark, interposed between them and the temple of the Constitution, which they seek to enter, for the purpose of violating. I do, Sir, most positively deny your assertion, that the Orange body laments that immunities have been granted to the Catholics, or denies them further concessions for the purpose, or on the principle of securing to themselves, or enjoying a selfish pre-eminence over their fellow-subjects. On the contrary, the Orangemen have viewed, with pleasure, every indulgence granted to the Catholics, whereby they have been rendered more secure in their persons and properties, and the free exercise of worshipping God in any manner they please; but we deprecate and oppose the granting political power to Catholics, who, we are convinced, must ever direct that power unceasingly, and always to the destruction and overthrow of our religion, and the establishment of their own; and this they never could hope to effect, otherwise than by a separation from England, and a total change of the Constitution. It is impossible that any Catholic could honestly and zealously administer the affairs of a Protestant state—and if we were even content to share every thing with them, and give up all establishment and pre-eminence, they would cease to be Catholics, if they did not perseveringly aim at supremacy, and the paramount establishment of the Popish religion. Catholics could not be content to share equal power with heretics, all civil interests must be overlooked; the advancement of the holy church, is with them an obligation which must take place of all others; and any of the most sacred engagements, if contrary to, or not coinciding with the interests of their church, are by that church dissolved, and declared void.

If

If we wished to enter into such a contract with them, it could not be; they are incapable of so contracting; they are not free agents; there is no reciprocal tie, pledge, or security—individuals might be inclined to keep good faith; but there is an absolute controuling power, which issues its mandates, and enforces obedience, wielding Heaven and Hell in either hand. We could not expect security on the score of gratitude. Their first success would be ascribed to God's direct interference in favour of the holy church; it would be considered impious, not to improve so fortunate a beginning, and as they would look on as dementated, and devoted victims. It may be asked, on what grounds I rest my assertions? My answer is—on the principles, sacred and political, character, spirit, and acts of the Romish church, its pastors and votaries, as handed down to us by history, from early ages to the present time; and those principles, as the Catholic theologists themselves tell us, can never change. Dr. Hufley, the titular Bishop of Waterford, tells us, in his pastoral letter, "that the Catholic faith is suitable to all climes, ages, and forms of government—and that it is immutable." The foulest atrocities ever yet perpetrated under the directing superstition of the Romish church, in the most remote ages, are at this day defended and supported by the writings of the Catholic divines, as infallibly just and * right—the church

* As an example, among several others, I refer to a pamphlet published in London, in the year 1795, printed for Cogblan, Duke-street, Grosvenor-square, by the Rev. John Milner, a Popish Priest, and entitled, "A Reply to the Report published by the Cisalpine Club, on the authenticity of the Protestation at the British Museum, &c. &c."

cannot err. Into this abyſs, morality, charity, truth, mercy, and all the virtues are precipitated and loſt. Every vice becomes a virtue, when exerciſed to promote the intereſts of the holy religion. It would be diſgusting to trace this truth through all the horrors, cruelties, plots, and maſſacres, which the page of hiſtory has recorded. I have been told, by ſome of the liberal enlightened men of the day, that they could in every inſtance, aſcribe theſe circumſtances, as they termed them, to political motives, and a train of leading events. Let me tell theſe enlightened philoſophers, that there muſt be ſome pre-diſpoſing cauſe, to rouse to action each latent and inherent vice or paſſion, whether natural or acquired. The moſt ferocious and paſſionate man may be quiet occaſionally, when not provoked; but ſhould he riſe in rage, and ſlay his brother, you might as well ſay, that it was not owing to his ferocity or paſſion, the accident being aſcribable to the leading event of the deceased having trod on the toe of the paſſionate man, which happened to be tender. I do not find any record in hiſtory, of any other ſect, ſave the Catholics, having perſecuted and maſſacred their fellow-chriſtians, to promote the intereſts or tenets of their own particular church; and it is very unfortunate that thoſe leading events have excluſively urged the Catholic to religious maſſacres and cruelties.

The Catholics in different climes, and in different ages, could not poſſibly, as a body, have ſimilar natural propenſities to cruelty, they are and muſt be, like all other men, good and bad, it therefore follows, that thoſe enormities, muſt be aſcribed to the pernicious and intolerant ſyſtem and doctrines of the Popiſh ſuperſtition. I think I have eſtabliſhed
my

my grounds on the best possible foundation, proof deduced from facts recorded, and open to the research of every one. That the Romish Church has lost nothing of its principles, character, influence or effect in this kingdom, the horrible transactions in Wexford, and indeed in almost all the disturbed counties, during the late rebellion, afford melancholy proofs. The Popedom is overthrown, but the Papal spirit still pervades the world, the Papal genius never sleeps, it is always watchful, enterprising, encroaching, and insatiable, wherever it gains any power, or footing, it never rests whilst there is any thing remaining to be had, it must have all. It is that encroaching spirit we have to dread, and guard against. I remember that a few years ago, the Catholics of this kingdom declared, they would be fully satisfied by the grant of certain privileges, and obtaining those, they would never ask further, they have since obtained all and more than they then required, and now they advance new claims. So would it be ad infinitum, until all power were exclusively their own. It has always been a principle of the Romish Church, not to be scrupulous about the means, provided the end was the advancement of the holy religion; a strict adherence to this practice has been strongly exemplified by the Irish Catholics, who first leagued themselves with the Presbyterians, a sect of Protestants, whom they always have detested more than those of the established Church, and then called into their aid the atheistical legions of France; the overthrow of a bad government, reform and republicanism, were then the avowed objects of this heterogeneous confederacy; but it is well known, that an underplot was formed by the Catholics, who being the majority, hoped, when the government was extinguished, that they the rightful inheritors should

repossess

repossess the usurped lands, and that they should be able to restore their old and holy religion to its ancient supremacy. I think the Protestants of Ireland having these records, and this experience before them, must be strangely infatuated indeed, should they hesitate a moment to refuse a participation of power to the Catholics, who would, as I have shewn, use that power to the subversion of our Constitution and establishment. And for these reasons, and not from the motives which you, Sir, have been pleased to ascribe to us, do the Orangemen of Ireland oppose the grant of further immunities to the Catholics. I do lament it as a great misfortune, that the State cannot with safety to its existence, command and profit by the entire attachment, energy, and services of so many of its subjects; would to God it were otherwise! every individual in the kingdom would then gain additional security to his rights and property, Ireland would become a nation, and the empire would be strengthened. If any man or body of men should from low or selfish views, oppose so great a general good, I should be the first to pronounce them enemies to their own interests, and those of their country.

But circumstanced as things now are, and indeed until some great change shall happen, every true Protestant in both kingdoms is bound on the principle of self-preservation, as well as duty, to resist further grants to the Catholics. The all-directing Providence may, in his own good time, cause these things to cease, and may allow us to become brothers, and one people. As yet the prospect is hid from us, certainly for wise purposes; but God has, within the last few years, ordained great changes in the world, and he has the power of effecting greater. We are told, that we shall all yet be members of one and the same

same pure and holy religion, it would be presumptuous to guess what that system may be, revelation and a chain of events corresponding to that revelation, almost clearly indicate, that it cannot be the Romish; nor do I at all suppose, that our Reformed Church has yet reached such a degree of perfection, as to become the standard. But whatever it may be, coming from him, it must be right and good; and he may exalt the most humble, and put down the proud. Thus far, I have endeavoured to state with as much fairness and truth as possible, the relative situation and principles of the Protestants and Catholics in this unhappy country, and I most solemnly declare that in doing this, I have not been actuated by animosity, or ill will. I did conceive myself bound to refute a most audacious calumny aimed at the Orangemen of Ireland. The defence and support of my own principle, and those of my brethren, against malicious misrepresentation, required that I should not hesitate to speak truths, which pained me in the writing, and always have pained me, when my thoughts have rested on them. But when every thing dear to us is at stake, a cautious delicacy would be weak and criminal. I do consider my Catholic countrymen, as by nature endued with the same feelings, virtues, and passions, as we are, and I do proudly think that the natives of this Isle in general, are not in natural endowments, inferior to any nation in the world; but I do lament that so many of my fellow-subjects have been so long enslaved by the tyranny of a superstition, which had unfortunately too many collateral aids, which it has made use of to continue the division and separation of a people, whose mutual interests ought long ago to have made them one. I lament this most sincerely, and I do say to the Catholic body of Ireland in general, that
the

the attainment of the concessions which you seem so eagerly to seek, would in all probability prove to be the greatest evil which could befall you, it would ruin us, yourselves, and our country; your priests and bigots would never give peace to you, or us; their restlessness, superstition, and ambition, would always embark you in new enterprizes, until Great Britain would be obliged to conquer this island again, or submit to its separation from the empire: without the intervention of foreign aid, the contest could not be long doubtful, and should even a separation for a time, be effected by strong foreign assistance, it could not be continued but by giving an establishment to your ally, which must end in your subjugation; in either case, Ireland would become the scene of bloody and destructive wars, and exhausted, wasted, and desolated, would prove a barren compensation to the victors. Humanity shudders at such a frightful prospect.

And now, Sir, suffer me to advert to some passages of your Memoire as you are pleased to term it, really if you had not given it a name, I should have been much at a loss how to refer it; I should have classed it among the non-descripts. You discover to us pretty clearly in your 15th and 16th pages, that the Catholics would consider it as a grievance left unredressed, and that the plan of the Union could not be complete, without the admission of the Catholics to full political power and privileges, and consequently to seats in the Imperial Legislature, this though not expressed in direct words, is strongly insinuated, but all doubt of your meaning is removed by subsequent parts of your Memoire, particularly in your 35th page. On the first reading, the audacity of the pretensions astonished me, as much as the

the Jesuitical slyness under which it is introduced, provoked me.

I always did feel it as the strongest inducement and argument in favour of an Union—that thereby the Protestant interest would be consolidated, and our establishment secured from encroachment, and that the Catholics of Ireland would necessarily sit down in acquiescence, the object of their wishes being placed beyond their reach; but it seems I had yet a lesson to learn, and farther experience to gain, of the insatiability, perseverance and encroachment of the Papal sect and genius.

Some of the best and wisest men of England have of late expressed in their speeches and writing, apprehensions of the plots and restless spirit of Popery, even in regard to England, where its power and influence is comparatively small; this new aim at encroachment, proves that their fears have not been vain, it also shews a co-operation between the English and Irish Catholics; and such discoveries may rouse the common sense of both countries.

From your 19th page I transcribe this sentence.—

"The Government in combination with a part of the people, may, so far as physical force confers authority, impose restrictions on the Catholics; but Ireland will pine over the dungeon of her children." This is the most laboured and pompous scrap of nonsense I have ever met with. I will construe this curious morceau, and illustrate its blundering absurdity. Government you say, combined with a part of the people, the minority, meaning the Protestants—form the physical force of the country—and may, so far as that physical force confers authority, impose restrictions on the

Catholics, the majority—who by your antithesis, must necessarily be considered, as forming the artificial force of the country—but Ireland will pine over the dungeon of her children. I need scarce point out to any reader, that a minority governing a country must be termed an artificial force—and that numbers constitute *physical* or *natural* force—And this from the learned Catholic advocate, Mr. McKenna. Pray, Sir, was your understanding lost in your religious zeal—or bewildered in the labyrinth of your own subtlety? or did you wish, by simulating a confusion of ideas, to prevent any mistake, as to your being legitimately an Irishman? But let me rescue this passage from the confusion which envelopes it, and give to it the only meaning to which it can be reconciled—it is a sort of oracular prediction, and it would be a pity to have it misunderstood or lost—

Talibus ex ady to dictis Cumœa Sibylla,
Horrendas canit ambages, antroque remagit
Obscuris vera involvens.

Let me interpret it thus: Government and the Protestants may, for a time, oppress and restrict the Catholics; but they will not acquiesce; they will be always ready on every opportunity to rebel against an usurping and unnatural Government, and to assert their superiority in this kingdom, which they claim from God and Nature. Analogy may serve to explain further. Bishop Hussey, in his Pastoral letter, page 10, says, "*The vast rock is already detached from the mountain's brow, and whoever opposes its descent and removal, must be crushed by his own rash endeavours.*" If my explanation of the sentence extracted from your Memoire, is right, I will leave it to the reader whether most to admire at the absurdity

dity of the composition, or the wickedness of the sentiment.

In a note to your 20th page, you say, "*What numbers during the late disturbances, would not believe the evidence of their senses, that every Papist was not a rebel! How many were sadly chagrined at the propriety with which the persons of property of the Romish communion acted!*" To this I answer, that the rebellion having very soon after its commencement, assumed the appearance of an holy insurrection, and being even so termed in one of the French Councils—and so many cruelties being committed by Catholics on Protestants—it is not wonderful, that generally every Papist should be suspected; and this suspicion was further encreased, by numberless instances of detected treachery among those Catholics who were in the military ranks—I say generally, because I should be sorry to think that there are not individuals of that communion, who have, from a sense of honour, adhered to their allegiance and duty, as yeomen and soldiers—and where so likely to find such, as among the higher ranks.

In your 23d page you say, "*That the penalties against Catholics ought to be repealed, if it were only to discountenance the Orange faction, by shewing the error and impotence of the association. The measure would be popular, and acceptable.*" Are you serious, Mr. M'Kenna, in recommending to any Administration, so great an innovation, to call it no more, merely for the sake of a fretful and peevish experiment—to see how the Orangemen would look, when discountenanced. Surely you either consider the men in power, as fools, or you mean to insult them. The measure of emancipation would, in your opinion,

on, be popular and acceptable; so would the establishment of Popery in Ireland, in all its ancient tyranny, because the Catholics are the populace, and to them it would be acceptable. Doctor McNevin and others have said, that Catholic emancipation, as it was called, was not an object really and seriously sought after. I think you and the Doctor are both right; and thus I reconcile the seeming contradiction. I do believe, that the Catholics who were engaged in the rebellious confederacy, before the insurrection actually took place, were very indifferent as to any concessions which could be made to them by a Protestant Parliament. They hoped soon to be masters of all, by a short and less incumbered mode—they expected to establish themselves on the ruins of our Government, Constitution, and Religion. They have been vanquished, and disappointed, and they would now gladly accept from us, that participation of political power, which they before disdained, and that merely for the purpose of making the next effort with increased strength, and under better auspices. Like wise Generals failing in the storm of the citadel, they wish to make a lodgment in the body of the work, and there cover themselves, waiting the opportunity of another assault.

In your 24th page you say, "*If every Catholic in Ireland had been a rebel, it ought to make no difference.*"

And again: "*If even such were the case, the moment of victory would be the critical time to make the concession. What might in the last year have been injudicious, as liable to be represented a pusillanimous compromise, might at this day be compliment, and heroic sacrifice.*" Bravo, Sir! most excellent and high-sounding

sounding rhodomantide! You shift your ground, and change your mode of attack, with admirable dexterity. You are a very Proteus; you assume every form.

Dr. Hufley and you have menaced and frightened us with focks and mountains, with dungeons, and physical force. Forgetting, or pretending to forget, that the civil and religious code was introduced by the great William, moulded and blended together, forming one indivisible establishment in Church and State; you have dared to ridicule this Constitution, and by splitting its founder in two, you affect to praise one side of the heroes mutilated image, that you may defame and vilify the other, by comparing it to John Wesley, or any other fanatic—you have endeavoured to divide the Protestants, by rousing those who are not Orangemen, against those who are—and you call upon the former, to make concessions to the Catholics, to spite the latter—You now cajole us, and try to persuade us, that having fought for our Constitution and Religion, and having conquered, that it would be magnanimous in the conquerors to surrender to the conquered—and having proved our courage, to give up all pretensions to sanity or common sense. It shews not strength of intellect, to undervalue too much that of others. Did you, Sir, imagine you were addressing fools or Quixottes; and on this ground you declare you are at issue with the Orangemen—I think the verdict ought to be *non compos*.

Your address to the Orangemen in the next page, about espionage, is too vague in its application to be understood, and too contemptible to be answered. I suppose the word was introduced, to shew your travel,

travel, and foreign education—by the bye, I have always understood, that such education as our countrymen usually receive in the Jesuit Colleges abroad, peculiarly qualifies them to become adepts in the system of espionage.

You next labour to prove that the Catholics, as such, had not any thing to do with the rebellion—and that the Catholic rebels were combated by Catholic militia regiments, Catholic noblemen, gentlemen, farmers, &c. It is painful and unpleasant to be under the necessity of renewing past grievances; but as you have provoked and challenged the detail, I must not flinch from it. In my turn I say, Sir, on this ground, I am at issue with you—As to the Catholic militia soldiers, many, I am proud and happy to acknowledge, did their duty like brave men; the conduct of the Limerick regiment stands particularly conspicuous. Some regiments have afforded shameful and melancholy instances to the contrary. It is a delicate point—I do not wish to insist on it—I will only observe, that soldiers taken from their families, removed from their early observances and habits, and placed in a mixed society of strangers, under a strict system of subordination and obedience, must soon forget their local and religious prejudices; and the latter sooner, perhaps, than any other. I have often heard old officers say, that the Irish Catholics became the better soldiers, the further and the longer they were removed from home. I am sure, had not uncommon pains been taken to mislead them, that all the Irish militia regiments would have done their duty, with fidelity and bravery. We can better form an opinion of the part the Catholics took in the late rebellion, by recurring to the conduct of the Catholic yeomen—men better educated, and of better situation.

situation than the militia foldiers—men who were or ought to have been free agents, who took up voluntarily the arms of their Sovereign (a Sovereign whom they had recently and publicly acknowledged as their greatest benefactor), and who bound themselves by a voluntary and solemn oath, to use those arms in his defence, and that of his Government. How they fulfilled that obligation, is lamentable to consider—what a disgusting picture of perfidy and perjury was disclosed, shortly after the insurrection took place! I speak of the city of Dublin—it was discovered that nine-tenths of the Catholics in the yeomanry corps, were United Irishmen, and had taken an oath to be true to the rebels, in direct contradiction to their sworn allegiance—and that many of them, after taking the United oath, had, on a principle of deliberate and pre-determined perjury, joined yeomanry corps, for the purpose of getting arms into their hands, learning the use of them, and turning them against us, perhaps in the very moment of attack. The consequences might have been horrible, had they not been prevented by a timely discovery. If any of the projected nightly attacks had taken place, the loyal yeoman, roused from his bed, would have treacherously fallen by the bayonets of those whom he might hasten to join, as friends and fellow-soldiers. It is remarkable, that in the city of Dublin above two thousand Catholics were desirous of admittance into the several yeomanry corps, during the six weeks immediately preceding the insurrection—and that most of these were proposed by Catholic yeomen, who afterwards either proved to be rebels, or were disarmed on strong suspicion.

These facts are notorious, and recent; they are open to investigation, and if not founded, may be disproved.

disproved. Of the Catholic yeomen in the country, I can only speak by hearsay—report has not been generally more favourable to them, than to their brethren in the city. Can any man hesitate to what he should ascribe such shocking violation of faith and morality? You, Sir, have acknowledged that there were twenty-five Priests actually and openly leaders of the rebels—pretty well this—and of the formidable remainder, consisting, by your calculation, of two thousand four hundred and seventy-five—how many fomented and encouraged the rebellion secretly? and were, as Dr. M'Neven and others of the principal traitors declared, most active agents in forwarding the cause. I do conceive, that the circumstance of so many as twenty-five Priests acting openly as leaders of the rebels—considering the character, habits of life, and education of Romish Priests—forms a strong proof of the warm interest their body at large took in the rebellion. As to individual noblemen and gentlemen, a sense of honour might keep them true to their engagements. As I before have mentioned, such men must be averse to treachery in the field; but had matters taken a more decided turn, it would have been hard to expect even from them more than neutrality.

In your 29th page you make your Catholic claimant say, “*That he does not desire the aggrandizement of his fellow-religionists, as a body; but that there should not be any obstacle in the way of any individual of that communion, to push to the utmost extent they are capable, the advantages of birth and fortune, talents and industry.*” And in your next page—“*So far as my observation extends, the reflecting Catholics in this country, never entertained a wish to give an establishment to their clergy.*” I think my detail of the character and principles of the Romish

mish church, and its votaries, shews that it is impossible that Catholics could sit down contented with civil advantages alone, neglecting the advancement of their clergy, and the aggrandizement of their religion. I shall here observe, that in a commercial country like this, property must be always shifting, and that in the course of time, particularly if aided by high lucrative situations, the balance of property, as well as numbers, would be found in the hands of Catholics, who would then consequently have a preponderance in the Legislative Bodies. Under these circumstances, I should be sorry that the Protestant establishment should be at the mercy of Catholic sufferance and moderation. This will also serve as an answer to the reasoning in your 35th page, about population and property.

The poetic picture presented in the note to your 31st page, is certainly more to be remarked for the exactness and truth of its delineation, as an historic piece, than for the pleasing choice of the subject, or the delicacy of the colouring. Some things and persons, when faithfully represented, become disgusting caricatures.

Your 32d page goes to tell us, "*That Catholics are men constituted as we are, and that forbearance under any restrictions, is not to be expected from them.*" This argument comes red hot from the school of the

* Mr. McKenna says, that the pillars of the established church are, the connexion with Britain, and the balance of property. I have here and elsewhere in this work, shewn that by granting to the Catholics full political power, both those pillars would be undermined, and the whole fabric of the Constitution overthrown.

new philosophy, and the rights of man. You launch boldly into innovation, forgetting all the former ties, rules, and restrictions of every civilised country in Europe. Pray, Sir, in what Catholic state of Europe, does a Protestant enjoy half the privileges, which a Catholic now enjoys in the Protestant state of Ireland? Certainly in none. Or in what Protestant state of Europe, does a Catholic enjoy so many immunities as in Ireland: And where, I may add, have concessions met with so ungrateful a return.

We may clearly infer from your 35th and 36th pages, that the Catholics, on the event of an Union, lay the same claim to admission into the imperial, as they now do into the Irish Legislature; and in the advancement of such their claims, you without hesitation get over all difficulties, by bold and unqualified assertions, unsupported by argument, and in contradiction to principles long established. "*You deny that any new Parliamentary test oath should be framed, to admit the jurisdiction of the Pope.*" And you as lightly get over the omission of the oath of supremacy; such an oath being totally unnecessary. "*As the jurisdiction of the Pope is as clearly ascertained as the jurisdiction of the Court of King's Bench, and would not be let in on temporal points, by omitting the oaths which assert the King's Ecclesiastical supremacy.*" &c. This is a most extraordinary assertion, and is contradicted by experience, and history, which shews, that in all countries, and during all ages, Popery has never failed, wherever it got footing, to intermeddle with, and embroil every thing temporal as well as spiritual, on one pretence or other; and the history of England, in particular, proves this in the strongest manner, even to the dethronement of her Kings.

How

How can any man presume to say, that the Popish jurisdiction is as well ascertained, as that of the Court of King's Bench, when every one knows that it requires but little sophistry to implicate almost all temporal with spiritual concerns, as ultimately, directly or indirectly involving the spiritual salvation of the actors: and who is to be the judge of this spiritual salvation and temporal discrimination? That very church, whose interest and character it is, to draw every thing within the vortex of its own dominion, and to use every handle and pretext for interference and domination. The Romish clergy may squabble among themselves, but should any laymen, or lay body interfere, the whole hive forgetting their internal disputes, would fasten on them, and sting them to death. But could even the inexpediency and impolicy of such concessions, as affecting the Protestant interest, be palliated or got over, the impracticability of such a measure remains, and must remain for ever, insurmountable, and unalterable, at least so long as Popery and the British Constitution shall continue. I do maintain that a Catholic cannot be admitted into the Irish or English Legislative Bodies, but by a violation of the Constitution, as established in 1788, in its very essence, and foundation, and by a breach of the King's coronation oath, and also of the fundamental articles of the union between Scotland and England. Is it possible, that a King of Great Britain could be so blind to the danger to which he would expose the Constitution he had sworn to protect, as to assent to such an innovation, not calling it by a stronger name? Or could he conscientiously think, that he acted according to the obligation of his coronation oath, by knowingly and deliberately exposing the Protestant establishment to the risque of so desperate an experiment? Religi-

ous establishment, is not the religion itself, but merely the mode of preserving it, and that can only be effected, by a political connection of the religious with the civil establishment, and this forms, what is called the Constitution in Church and State—I do again assert, that such our Constitution cannot admit to its Legislative, Administrative, or Executive functions, any man, or body of men, who deny and violate one of its vital and fundamental principles, by cherishing a foreign supremacy, and paying an implicit obedience to it, either in spiritual or temporals. And I do here contend, that this fundamental principle of the British Constitution, has been established on the surest and most unerring grounds, namely the conviction of the many evils attending foreign spiritual interference, derived and deduced from the experience of many centuries. Were we now to separate Church and State, we would virtually declare, that the reformation and revolution were founded on bad policy, and false principles, and that the settlement of the Crown by stat. 12th and 13th W. 3d. c. 2. was an illegal usurpation. I hope and trust, that no Minister will ever be found hardy enough to bring forward such a question, in a Protestant Parliament, or so daring as to advise a King of Great Britain to give his consent to the annihilation of the title, by which he holds his Crown.

To enter into a full historical and legal discussion of these questions, would far exceed my limits. Let me ask Mr. M'Kenna, and the Catholics, on what grounds they expect all these experiments and sacrifices in their favour? Is it because they have so well requited us for past benefits? Do they advance their claims on the score of their loyalty to their King,
or

or their brotherly love and charity to their Protestant fellow-subjects? Or do they come forward smeared with the blood of the Kildare, Carlow, Mayo and Wexford Protestants, and brandishing their pikes, to terrify us into concession. I cannot help saying, that there is a hardened and indecent assurance, in the time and form of their demands. What the heart of man could scarcely imagine, in the most peaceful and praiseworthy times, is now ushered in, with unblushing impudence, at the heels of rebellion and massacre. For shame! you ought to have sat down rebuked, chastened, and grateful, for the magnanimous moderation of your victors. Instead of new favours and concessions, it might have been expected, at the eve of the late atrocious rebellion, that all former ones should have been revoked and rescinded, and that the Popish superstition should have been at once rooted from the land, by the banishment of its Priests, and the forbiddance of the Mass, as incompatible with true Christian charity, morality, and a just observance of the laws of society in a Protestant State. Could such an event take place, without personal cruelty, bloodshed, or civil disturbance, I do not hesitate to say, that the Catholics of Ireland, would ultimately be greater gainers by the change, than even the Protestants.

I will conclude by warning the Government against a practice, which has been too common among the parties of this country, namely that of treating and parleying with the Catholics, as a political body, and making stalking-horses of them, and their claims, for the purposes of mutual embarrassment and vexation. This weak and wicked policy feeds, and has fed, unjustifiable pretensions. This has been a sort of game; but "*hæ nugæ seria ducant in mala.*" It is

is not wise to seek hollow, unreal, and fugitive connexions, in pursuance of a system of Machiavelian policy, thereby disgusting and detaching those whom reciprocity, congenial interests, and common sense, indicate as the true friends of a good Government, the friends and supporters of the Throne, the Constitution, and the Laws.—May they be perpetual.

AN ORANGEMAN.

Dublin, January 14, 1799.

AN APPENDIX.

APPENDIX.

SINCE writing the foregoing letter, I have read a pamphlet on the question of Union, wherein Catholics and Orangemen are introduced. Had I sooner seen this production, I should have given it some notice in the body of my work; but I must now confine myself to such few remarks, as time, and the limits of a short Appendix, will admit.

The pamphlet I allude to, is entitled, "*An impartial view of the causes leading this country to the necessity of an Union,*" &c. &c. &c. and is publicly ascribed to a gentleman, whose name, though mutilated of its barbarous O, is still sufficiently indicative of Aboriginism, and Catholicism. This circumstance may strike many as not favouring the promise of impartiality, avowed in the title-page; but let us examine how this promise has been kept. This gentleman gives us an history, or historic sketch, of English and Irish relation, from the reformation to the present time; if that can be called an history, which details the injustice, oppression, and tyranny of the English over the unfortunate natives, without fairly stating the circumstances, and necessity,

necessity, which obliged England to maintain, by strong and coercive measures, her dominion over a savage and hostile nation, which had alwas displayed an inveterate dislike to the English, their laws, manners, and customs, and which had renewed, whetted, and increased all its antient antipathies, by superadded hatred and aversion to the religion then newly introduced among them, and by an obstinate adherence to the Popish superstition. This gentleman seems to forget, that since England has had sufficient respite from her own evils and disturbances, to attend to the settlement of Ireland, that all her endeavours, and those of the Protestant settlers, have been counteracted, baffled, and checked by the growth and influence of Popery, which has been the real obstacle to the peace and prosperity of their country. So much for historic impartiality.

This O gentleman dates the Orange institution so far back, as the year 1793. He says it was founded by some of the factious and disappointed aristocracy—and that it produced the late rebellion. I do most positively deny the truth of every one of these statements. I have in this work already shewn that an association of some of the middle and lower orders of the people, in the county of Armagh, first assumed the name of Orangemen, about the year 1794; but Orange societies never became so general, as to be worthy of political consideration, until the year 1797, (the real date of the Orange institution) when they were transplanted to Dublin, and when the rebellion, which he says they produced, was arrayed, and had even appointed a day for rushing into action. This gentleman has attempted to prove this charge against the Orangemen, by saying that the Catholics only rebelled in counties where

where they were *intimidated* into rebellion by Orangemen. I will ask him, were there Orange societies to intimidate the Catholics of Mayo and Wexford into rebellion and massacre? Were there Orangemen to any intimidating amount in Wicklow, Carlow, Kildare and Kilkenny? But this gentleman, by way of clinching his proof, with triumphant exultation, quotes and rests upon the counties of Limerick, Clare, and Galway, as patterns and examples of Catholic loyalty. Unfortunately his exultation has been short lived indeed—his ink has had scarce time to dry on the paper, ere his proofs and their loyalty have vanished, and the standard of rebellion has been seen to float over the face of those *peaceable* counties.

In contradiction to his assertion, that the Orange institution has grown out of factious and disappointed aristocracy—I do say, that there never yet has been any political institution, so completely independent, so purely disinterested, so single in its object, and so free from factious or aristocratic influence, as the Orange association; I am an Orangeman, I know that it must be so—no man can become an Orangeman, from impure motives, without perjury. As to this gentleman's statement of Catholics lawfully prosecuting lawful claims, of Catholic firmness, steady attachment to the Constitution, and loyalty, I will only observe, that such a fiction would better become a poet than an historian.

I cannot help adding, that it is remarkable how seldom apostacy from Popery extinguishes hereditary affection to the cause.

E

I do

I do also deny, that the oaths taken by United Irishmen and Orangemen, are equally unlawful, under the construction of the statutes—as the matters to which Orangemen are bound, form no part of the gravamen, against which those laws provided, nor could have been in the contemplation of the Legislature, whose only object was to guard against and suppress seditious conspiracies, then existing. The comprehensive penning of the statute of 37th of G. 3d. was occasioned by the dexterity shewn by the conspirators in eluding the former statute—which clearly appears by collating the two acts. Wherefore I conceive that a Judge of the land, before whom any man should be tried for taking the Orangeman's oath, would leave it to the Jury to determine, not only as to the fact of his having taken such oath, but also as to the tendency thereof, and the *quo animo*, of the swearing—all which ingredients are necessary to constitute crime. I believe no Jury could be found, hardy enough to bring in a verdict of conviction against any man, on the ground of the Orangeman's oath, which goes solely to the support of the King and our glorious Constitution, and that in the most direct terms—and thus, Sir, if I am right, your appeal to the twelve Judges, proves to be a solemn and pompous nullity—if conviction took place, the Judge must pronounce the sentence of the law; but I conceive, that such a conviction could not happen, except, indeed, from a packed Jury of United Irishmen, and even they might be deterred by the dread of an at-taint.

You ought, Sir, to have been more cautious, and have chosen sure grounds, before you ventured to prefer so serious an accusation against Legislators, whom you have presumed to represent, as publicly administering

administering oaths, in direct violation of a statute made by themselves; and for the breach of which, they were publicly co-operating "*in hanging and whipping wretches*—and this crude opinion you publish and proclaim to the people of this agitated country, and tell them, that it causes a dissolution of all government. I do suppose that party and Catholic zeal against the Orangemen, blinded you to all the consequences of such a publication, which even truth could not excuse or justify, under the present circumstances. The Press, in its zenith of licentious audacity; never vomited forth a more dangerous or deadly political poison.

Were I not confined in time and limits, I should animadvert on other parts of this pamphlet, which, notwithstanding its partialities and misrepresentations, on the points I have noticed, its affectation of intimate acquaintance with Cabinets, and its familiar exposition of public and leading characters, certainly shews considerable ingenuity, wit, and satire, and contains many forcible arguments in favour of an Union, conveyed in a pleasing, familiar, and impressive style.

Dublin, January 22, 1799.

F I N I S.

admitting that the violation of the law
by individuals is the basis of the
very public law which is now being
enforced. And this is the reason
why the people of the United States
will never be able to reach a
state of civilization until they have
learned to respect the rights of
others. It is the duty of every
citizen to stand up for the
principles of justice and to
oppose any and every attempt
to subvert the law. The people
of the United States are a
free people, and they have the
right to live in peace and
harmony with each other.

What I am saying is that I think
it is the duty of every citizen
to stand up for the principles
of justice and to oppose any
and every attempt to subvert
the law. It is the duty of every
citizen to respect the rights of
others and to live in peace and
harmony with each other. The
people of the United States are
a free people, and they have
the right to live in peace and
harmony with each other.

D. C. January 22, 1870

F I N I S H

ad
by
v
cor
py
toll
me
aga
l
co
fla
ab
de
ne
na
co
mi
l
li
e
I
li